SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

26th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XXVI, No. 14 | P. O. Box 6226A, Washington, D. C. 20015 | © September 15, 1996

How the Dole Economic Plan Would Gut Research

For a genuine doomsday prescription for science and technology, nothing in politics comes close to the economic plan at the core of Bob Dole's presidential campaign—a balanced budget by 2002, with a 15 percent income-tax cut, plus additional tax reductions, largely financed by huge spending reductions and a hoped-for surge in economic growth. The Dole budget plan is keyed to unprecedented cuts in the so-called discretionary sector of the federal budget—the portion that finances civilian science and technology, among other federal programs.

If dual improbables occur, and Dole is elected and carries out his budget-balancing design, government support of civilian science and technology is destined for a historic nosedive that will make the dreary years of 1995-96 look like the Golden Age of science and government. Republican ideology holds that if Washington gets out of the way, other sources of support for research in academe and elsewhere will gush from a revitalized national economy. But early signs from the ongoing shrinkage of the government's role provide scant evidence in behalf of this cheery scenario.

Generally cagey about where the spending reductions will fall, Dole hasn't publicly earmarked R&D to help offset his proposed tax cuts. In fact, though pledged to abolish the Department of Energy, he told an audience in Albuquerque on August 30 that he would merely downsize DOE and that the nearby Los Alamos and Sandia laboratories are "going to remain open." That's good for New Mexico, where candidates must promise to support the two big DOE payrolls. But in the zero-sum game of federal budgeting, that's all the worse for other dependents of government spending.

Spineless in Bethesda—P. 2
Non-Profit Pay Check—P. 5

The long-term plan for spending reductions adopted last year by Congressional Republicans are amply severe, and the me-too plan hurriedly announced by the White House last spring is only slightly less so. However, Clinton's plans for R&D cuts are so vague that Congressional Republicans contend that he has winked at his R&D agency heads and told them to plan big for post-election [SGR, August 1: "Budget Hearing Casts No Light on 2002 R&D Plans"]. For the science agencies, strong Presidential support would be a departure from the general indifference that has prevailed throughout Clinton's first term. More likely, a second term would bring continued emphasis on the industrial-technology programs favored by the Administration.

In any case, both Congress and the President have scheduled the biggest cuts for the so-called outyears—a remote later-on that's conveniently far off—leaving overall federal support for civilian research generally intact at present, but without growth and, therefore, timid and sluggish.

Dole's design would rapidly make a transition from austerity to destruction, necessarily cutting fast and deep, far more so than anything suggested in the rampaging opening year of the current Republican control of Congress. Small Medicare reductions and an assumed increase in economic growth are supposed to ease the bite, but as *Business Week* recently calculated, "The bulk of the cuts—more than $400 billion—would have to come from all other domestic programs, from national parks to highways." They're all in the discretionary budget.

Discretionary programs are those that live or die on annual Congressional appropriations, in contrast to Medicare and other entitlements, which are immortal and politically insulated against reductions.

(Continued on Page 3)

In Brief

More crises in science than even dedicated gloom-mongers have proclaimed are set for a day of anguishing September 19 at George Washington University, in Washington, DC, host to a symposium titled "Science in Crisis at the Millennium." With White House Science and Technology Advisor John Gibbons as the keynote speaker, the ensuing talks are all titled "The Crisis of"—followed by "Quality," "Knowledge," "Funding," "Peer Review," "Human Genetics," "Misconduct," "the Press," "Science and the Law," and "Morale." The impresario of the maudlin event is Horace Freeland Judson, head of GW's Center for History of Recent Science.

Will Gibbons, on board since day one of the Clinton Administration, stay on for another tour in a second Clinton Administration? That's ultimately up to the President, of course, but the word is that Gibbons, whose main residence is in rural Virginia, recently renewed the lease on the apartment he rents in downtown Washington.

A survey by NSF and the Census Bureau on origins of innovation in industrial firms found "internal sources, clients and customers" first in importance; "suppliers of materials and components" came in second; at the bottom were "government labs, technical institutes and consulting firms." (NSF Data Brief No. 7, available without charge from: Lawrence M. Rausch, Division of Science Resources Studies, NSF, Suite 965, Arlington, Va. 22230; tel. 703/306-1773; e-mail: <srspubs@nsf.gov>).

Scheduled to quit Washington on September 27 for campaigning, Congress still has a long way to go on appropriations for the coming fiscal year. But with memories of public anger over last year's shutdowns, continuing resolutions are expected to keep the money flowing.

After Chistopher Reeve Appeal, NIH Finds $10 Million

Has the Christopher Reeve phenomenon undermined efforts to banish the old "disease of the month club" from decisionmaking at the National Institutes of Health? Though ineradicable, lobbying for shares of the NIH budget has taken a beating under the regime of Director Harold Varmus.

Varmus has repeatedly declared that "scientific opportunity," rather than patient counts or public appeals, should govern biomedical research priorities. But that was before the arrival in biomedical politics of Reeve, of Superman film renown, paralyzed in a riding accident last year. In May, in highly publicized visits to the White House and Congress, Reeve pleaded for additional support for spinal-injury research and was assured by President Clinton that $10 million would be added to the $47 million currently available in the NIH budget.

Reeve, in evident physical distress and determined to regain his health, elicited public tears and admiration for his courage and commitment. NIH officials, however, whispered among friends that politics was pandering to an emotional appeal that threatened their methods for allocating scarce research money. But, as mere sideline observers in big-league Washington politics, the Bethesda brass prudently remained quiet on a matter that the White House was coming to recognize as politically interesting.

On August 26, in a televised talk at the opening session of the Democratic National Convention, Reeve repeated his message of hope and the need for research, expanding his appeal to Alzheimer's, Parkinson's and other brain diseases. The appearance of a quadriplegic on the political stage, unusual as it was, harmonized with the Convention theme of Bill Clinton as a caring President, though, in fact, Congressional Republicans have been the source of NIH's good budget fortunes over the past two years, as well as strong supporters in prior times. If the Clinton White House had its way, the NIH budget would be considerably below its present level.

On August 27, NIH faxed to reporters an "NIH Backgrounder" titled "Curing Paralysis: A Total NIH Research Effort."

"The dramatic speech by Christopher Reeve at the Democratic National Convention last night," it stated, "has focused the Nation's attention on the progress that biomedical research has made and the promise it holds to cure paralysis." NIH supports a large and diverse program of research aimed at this goal, it said. But then came a statement from Director Varmus somewhat at odds with the Backgrounder's focus on paralyzing spinal-cord injury:

"Our ability to design new approaches to many diseases," Varmus stated, "depends on basic research that illuminates the fundamental properties of molecules, cells and tissues, such as the brain and spinal cord. Progress against challenging disorders is the result of the US government's policy to support research based on scientific excellence rather than on presumed relevance to certain disorders."

The Backgrounder also referred to an "NIH Workshop on Spinal Cord Injury: Emerging Concepts," September 30-October 1.

Space for the meeting, at the Pooks Hill Marriott Hotel in Bethesda, near the NIH campus, was booked on June 28, about a month after the paralyzed Reeves first visited Washington—an unconnected sequence of events, an organizer of the workshop told SGR. The workshop announcement states that the meeting was organized at the suggestion of Director Varmus, and "is designed to stimulate and identify new areas for research in spinal cord injury."

On September 10, without waiting for the workshop to identify new areas for research, NIH announced that an additional $10 million would be made available for spinal-cord research, with the money coming from various accounts at NIH, including $3 million for this year from the NIH Director's Discretionary Fund. Some of the money will finance 1996 applications "that would not have been supported due to budget constraints," NIH explained. Nearly $1 million is to be awarded for "a center grant to study central nervous system trauma and edema and loss of blood that usually accompany spinal cord injury." The announcement added that the $10 million increase is to be divided between the balance of fiscal 1996 and fiscal 1997.

As background to the Reeve affair, it is illuminating to recall the pronouncement in the House report accompanying NIH's money bill in 1995. Reflecting the views of NIH's most influential supporter on Capitol Hill, Subcommittee Chairman John Porter (R-Ill.), the report expressed approval of Varmus's insistence on "scientific opportunity" as the criterion for research, and praised Varmus for "compelling testimony ... about the problems inherent in using other decision rules to allocate funding."

The report added, "The Committee wants to avoid endorsing any methodology that could be characterized as focusing on the 'disease of the month.' "

Has NIH unavoidably caved in to politics, or is it shrewdly hopping a ride on a political bandwagon that spotlights biomedical research and arouses public support for more? The only certainty is that whatever is going on in Bethesda is off the normal track for supporting spinal-injury research.

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Glen D. Grant

Published by Science & Government Report, Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscriptions: Institutions, $490.00 (two years, $840.00). Bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. NW, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. For subscription service: PO Box 6226A, Washington, DC 20015. Tel. 1-800-522-1970; in Washington, DC 785-5054. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date. ISSN 0048-9581.

. . . R&D Stuck at 14 Percent of Discretionary Funds

(Continued from Page 1)

The discretionary pot, about $540 billion this year, is surrounded by many ardent competitors—including the Pentagon and veterans and housing programs—among whom civilian research agencies are puny political innocents, mainly surviving on faith in research and good will, rather than political swat. Some $260 billion in the discretionary account is politically guaranteed to the Defense Department, to which Dole has promised even more money.

Another $20 billion in discretionary spending goes to international activities, leaving roughly $260 billion in non-defense discretionary funds to finance all civilian domestic programs. That includes R&D, budgeted this year for about $72 billion, of which defense gets $38 billion and civilian programs $34 billion.

No statute limits the civilian research agencies to a preset slice of the total discretionary budget. But the political process develops patterns that tend to endure from year to year. One of the durables is that R&D, civilian and military, annually receives 13-14 percent of the discretionary budget. The Pentagon's share has declined from a height of 75 percent of federal R&D spending during the Cold War, and now stands at about 53 percent. Clinton once pledged to get it down to a 50-50 share, but nothing more has been heard about that for some time.

Through the 1980s and the early part of this decade, as federal support for civilian and military R&D experienced substantial real growth, the R&D share of the discretionary sector nonetheless remained in the 13-14 percent range. The constancy of the percentage should discourage swooning over the political commitment to research. As noted by Kei Koizumi in the latest annual budget review of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, *Research and Development: AAAS Report XXI, FY 1997*, even with the dollar growth, the percentage of discretionary spending did not change.

"This suggests," the AAAS states, "that the enormous growth in federal support of R&D over the past several decades has resulted not only from a commitment to science and technology but perhaps more importantly from the general growth of discretionary spending which allowed greater investment to be made in a variety of areas including S&T."

Dole's election chances are negligible at this point. And even if an electoral miracle occurs, it's generally expected that he would moderate his economic plan.

So, realism suggests that the impact on R&D implicit in the Dole economic plan will not occur. But Dole is one of two candidates for President, and the main certainty about Presidential politics is that it often produces surprising outcomes. The Dole economic plan, therefore, should be recognized for what it is—a prescription for dismantling much of the civilian federal enterprise, in which science and technology are among the most vulnerable targets.—DSG

It's 'Vampire Economics'

On record as appalled by what he regards as the neglect of research by the President and Congress, Rep. George Brown, of California, the Democratic champion of science on Capitol Hill, has been inspired to new heights of disdain by the Dole economic plan.

"Vampire economics" that would "devastate" science and technology with a 40 percent reduction in spending is how Brown described Dole's designs in a statement September 5 to a forum of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee.

Brown, dislodged as Chairman of the renamed House Science Committee when the Republicans took control of Congress last year, may be a suspect analyst because of his party affiliation. But he remains in close touch with the research agencies within the Committee's jurisdiction, which include NASA, NSF, and the research functions of EPA and the Departments of Energy and Commerce. His dour forecasts are based on advice from DOE and Commerce on how they would retrench to live within Dole's s budget.

Under Dole's proposal for a $32 billion reduction in spending by DOE over the next six years, Brown said, DOE's "civilian science program would cease," leading to the closure of the Argonne and Fermi labs in Illinois, plus labs in Ames, Iowa, and Brookhaven, New York; the recently opened Jefferson facility in Newport News, Va., and the Stanford Linear Accelerator.

Also doomed under the Dole budget plans, Brown said, would be DOE's Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, the Energy Technology Center, in Morgantown, W. Va., and Colorado's National Renewable Energy Laboratory. The Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, in Washington, would lose 70 percent of its funding, Brown estimated, while "research universities and private companies across the country that receive DOE R&D funding would have to terminate their programs."

Research programs in the Department of Commerce would be terminated or eviscerated, Brown said, by Dole's plan to reduce the Department's outlays from the $3.6 billion appropriated last year to $1.1 billion per year. The proposed reduction would leave Commerce with $6.6 billion over the six-year period of the Dole plan; of that amount, he added, nearly $4 billion will be required for the year 2000 census.

Noting that 40 percent of the Commerce budget goes to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Brown said that NOAA would have to abandon its $6 billion longterm program for updating weather satellites and radars and close research laboratories in Colorado, California and elsewhere. Other Commerce programs would shrink or disappear, he said.

Clinton and Science: Record Doesn't Glow—But

After nearly four years of Clinton and two years of Republican Congressional rule, what do we know about who's better or worse for the national research enterprise and what the past indicates for the future?

Contrary to early expectations in the research establishment, nirvana for science did not occur during the first two years of the Clinton Administration. The mandarins were indeed exhilarated and filled with hope by Clinton's pre-inaugural appointment of John Gibbons as White House Science and Technology Advisor—in contrast to the sluggish, months-later appointments for that post in the Reagan and Bush Administrations. Gibbons, longtime Director of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment and confrere of Al Gore, was a familiar and respected figure in science-policy circles.

With Gibbons' appointment as an omen, the expectation was that a youthful President out of Georgetown, Oxford and Yale would be keen for science. Only later was it realized, as Maxine Singer, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, has pointed out [SGR, December 1, 1995], that scientists were absent from the immense circle cultivated by the gregarious Bill Clinton during his lifelong campaign for the Presidency. Gore, a certified environmental and research enthusiast, initially handled research for the Administration, but was soon diverted to many other tasks, lessening Gibbons' access to the inner political circle at the White House.

In many respects, science was a deadspot in the President's consciousness once the major posts were filled in his Administration. On the recommendation of Gibbons, Clinton went for first-rate appointments and retentions at the major research and health-related agencies—Harold Varmus at NIH, Neal Lane at NSF, Dan Goldin at NASA, Martha Krebs at DOE, David Kessler at FDA, and Mary Good as technology chief at the Commerce Department. There were other good postings, too, though the top research job at the Department of Agriculture has been empty and neglected for most of Clinton's presidency.

Once settled into office, however, Clinton paid scant attention to science. The budgets he sent to Congress for NSF, NIH, NASA and basic research at DOE were fairly limp. In the lost battle for survival of the Superconducting Super Collider, the White House was AWOL. A structure embracing all government research agencies, the National Science and Technology Council, and a President's Committee of Advisors for Science and Technology were established, but neither wields power or influence in government affairs.

Science was not on the Presidential agenda during the first two years. However, Clinton and technology, as contrasted with science, were a different story. With promotion of high-tech industry central to his goal of economic growth, Clinton proposed and in large part received big budget increases for cooperative research programs with industry at the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Pentagon. On another front, the financially disastrous Space Station was politically reconfigured as a partnership with the ex-Soviet Union, and defended as deserving of support as a foreign-policy venture, rather than solely pork-barrel aid for the ailing aerospace industry.

Toward the end of Clinton's first two years, the science establishment was muttering complaints of neglect and disappointment, as were old friends of science on Capitol Hill. But in Washington, where "compared to what?" is a yardstick of judgment, the arrival of the Republican Congress in January 1995 markedly reconfigured the establishment's attitudes toward the Clinton Administration.

With the Contract for America calling for major reductions in the discretionary spending that's the lifeblood of government-supported research, the Clinton Administration cast itself as the savior of science. The lately deplored Clinton performance on matters scientific began to look relatively good to the policy and budget monitors posted in Washington by scientific and academic organizations. And they looked even better as Congressional Republicans actually proceeded with their designs to deconstruct segments of the federal research enterprise and cut spending in many others.

Down went the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, the fledgling National Biological Service, and the venerable Bureau of Mines. Funding was severely reduced for NIST's external programs. Public concern, if not revulsion, developed in time to fend off Republican plans to terminate the Departments of Energy, Commerce, Labor, and Education. But failure was due to lack of votes, not an absence of malign intent.

That's where we now stand as election day nears. Both parties, of course, have expressed the requisite kind words about science and technology. But it's the record that speaks loudest. With Bob Dole's Presidential chances generally rated nil, the focus turns to a second Clinton term. The pollsters glimpse a possibility of Republican loss of control in one or both houses of Congress, but whatever the outcome , the harsh designs of the Contract With America have been politically buried.

A re-elected Clinton will therefore face a less hostile Congress, and maybe even a friendly one. Scientists, however, will have no reason to pop the corks over the implications for their profession. Over nearly four years, Bill Clinton has displayed scant interest in science—whether in budgets proposed or ceremonial attentions. There's no reason to expect a dramatic conversion.

For science, Clinton is okay, but surely not great. The alternative, however, is less appealing.—DSG

Non-Profit Pay Checks

The American Council on Education

With a membership that includes some 1800 post-secondary schools and educational associations, the American Council on Education (ACE) describes itself as "the nation's umbrella higher education association." The umbrella covers a lot of activity—monitoring national education politics, lobbying Congress and the White House, orchestrating advocacy efforts, and producing news and professional publications. The tasks are handled by a staff of about 180, operating last year on a budget of about $21.5 million.

Many of the member schools, of course, exist in modest financial circumstances, a condition that is matched by ACE senior executive pay scales, which are comparatively modest, and in some cases parsimonious, by the standards of Washington's big-league non-profit associations.

The ACE's latest tax return, covering tax year 1994, reports compensation of $207,889, plus $61,951 in benefits, for Robert H. Atwell, the President of the ACE since 1984 and Vice President for six years prior to that.

In tax year 1993, Atwell received $189,422 in compensation and $58,172 in benefits. The figures for 1992 were $175,948 and $55,811. (Atwell is retiring from the ACE Presidency on November 1 and will become a senior consultant for A.T. Kearney, Inc., a management consulting firm, and its executive-search division. His successor at the ACE is Stanley O. Ikenberry, former President of the University of Illinois.)

No other officers, directors or trustees received compensation or benefits, the ACE reported on IRS Form 990, the tax return for tax-exempt, non-profit organizations—mainly schools, philanthropic foundations, professional associations and research organizations. The tax return, which was filed last month, covers the ACE fiscal year, October 1, 1994, to September 30, 1995.

Below the Presidential level, financial rewards were far lower for all others in the organization, and annual increases were proportionately smaller, as indicated in the ACE 1994 tax data on compensation and benefits for the five highest-paid employes:

Terry Hartle, Vice President, Government Relations, $130,394; $38,857.

Henry Spille, Vice President, Center for Adult Learning and Educational Credentials, $120,000; $36,051.

Sheldon Steinbach, Vice President and General Counsel, $118,404; $35,284.

Barbara Uehling, Director, Business-Higher Education Forum, $113,190; $33,731.

Madeleine Green, Vice President, Center for Leadership Development, $106,606; $31,769.

Over the 1992-94 period, annual raises for these employes ranged from $2000 to $5000.

Revenues at the ACE, from membership fees, publication sales and various services, have been fairly stable and closely in line with expenditures in recent years. The tax return for 1992 reports revenues of $18,610,514 and expenditures of $18,331,426 million, for an "excess"—the non-profit term for profit—of $279,088. Revenues and expenditures increased by about $1 million in each of the following two years, leaving the ACE safely in the black by several hundred thousand dollars.

Previously published Pay Checks: Howard Hughes Medical Institute, April 15; National Academy of Sciences, May 1; American Chemical Society, May 15; American Psychological Association, June 1; American Association for the Advancement of Science, June 15; American Psychiatric Association, July 1; Association of American Medical Colleges, August 1.

Next: The Association of American Universities

R&D Aid for Former USSR

Some $10 million in assistance to the financially flattened research enterprise in the ex-Soviet Union has been reported by the US Civilian Research and Development Foundation for Independent States of the Former Soviet Union.

Authorized by Congress in August 1995, the Foundation reported last week that it has approved 238 cooperative research agreements between teams of scientists and engineers in the US and the former Soviet Union (FSU). The Foundation, headquartered near Washington, is providing about 80 percent of the money, with the balance coming from the governments in the recipient countries. The announcement by the Foundation noted, "Of the 238 awards, 23 percent involve former [sic] FSU defense researchers who have pledged to conduct research on these projects in a civilian environment."

Initially financed by $5 million from the Defense Department and a matching gift from philanthropist George Soros, the Foundation also announced the arrival of new funds for future disbursement: $1 million from the National Institutes of Health for a program of Collaborations in Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences with NIH intramural and extramural researchers (deadline for applications, February 15); $2 million from the National Science Foundation for general support, and a matching $3 million from the Defense Department under the so-called Nunn-Lugar program to promote demilitarization in the FSU. One of the major goals of the Foundation is to provide civilian research opportunities for former military researchers, and to discourage their emigration to rogue nations eager for their military experience and skills.

The Foundation's Board is chaired by Peter Raven, of the Missouri Botanical Garden. Gerson S. Sher, an international affairs specialist formerly at the National Science Foundation, is Executive Director. Address: US Civilian Research and Development Foundation, 1800 North Kent St., Suite 1106, Arlington, Va. 22209; tel. 703/526-9720; fax 703/526-9721; e-mail: <information@crdf.org>; internet: <http://www.crdf.inter.net>.

Job Changes & Appointments: NSF, OSTP, NIH, Etc.

More senior traffic at the National Science Foundation, where the latest to announce departure plans is ***William Harris***, who's been with NSF for nearly two decades, including the last four as Assistant Director heading the Mathematical and Physical Sciences Directorate. Harris is leaving next month to head Biosphere 2, the trouble-plagued, closed-ecological lab near Tucson, Arizona, which recently was adopted by Columbia University. Harris will be President and Executive Director of what is referred to as the Columbia Tucson campus, as well as Associate Director of the Earth Institute on Columbia's New York campus.

Also at NSF: ***Juris Hartmanis***, Professor of computer engineering at Cornell University, is the successor to ***Paul Young***, Assistant Director for Computer and Information Science and Engineering for the past two years. Young left the Foundation September 15 for a one-year sabbatical prior to returning to the University of Washington. ***Joseph Bordogna***, Assistant Director for Engineering since 1991, has been appointed Acting Deputy Director of the Foundation. Bordogna takes over from ***Anne Petersen***, who's moving to the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Michigan, where she will be Senior Vice President for Programs. The Deputy Director, number two in the NSF hierarchy, also serves as Chief Operating Officer of the agency. Also gone recently is ***Cora B. Marrett***, head of NSF's Directorate for Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences, who returned to the University of Wisconsin.

The cluster of departures appears to be random coincidence in the routine tides of academic comings and goings, rather than a mass escape of discontents.

But the appointment process often moves slowly at the Foundation, especially for the Presidentially appointed Deputy Director's job and the vacancy-riddled National Science Board, NSF's gaseous policymaking body and statutory rubber stamp for big grants. Eight seats vacant since last May, plus an earlier vacancy, left the Presidentially appointed Board without a quorum at one recent meeting for lack of full-fledged members. The expirees can hang on in non-voting consultant status, while official business can be conducted by a subset of members on the Executive Committee, thus enabling the Board to conduct its business, such as it is.

In the protracted process for filling these Presidential Board posts, the White House announced its intent to nominate five members in July [SGR, August 1], and since has announced its intent to nominate three others: ***Eamon Kelly***, President of Tulane University; ***Richard Tapia***, Professor of Computational and Applied Mathematics, Rice University, and ***Mary K. Galliard***, Professor of Physics, UC Berkeley. However, the detailed paperwork and security review for a Presidential appointment takes a long time, and, as of last week, only three Board nominations had been formally submitted to the Senate, a Republican body that feels no urgency for approving appointments by a Democratic President two months prior to election day. Swift confirmation in the crowded pre-election Senate agenda is possible, an NSF official told SGR, but he acknowledged it's doubtful.

Staying, NSF Head Says

The science-policy rumor mill in Washington has recently been rattling with reports that Neal Lane, Director of the National Science Foundation, is leaving soon for a university presidency, with the top spot at the University of Michigan most often mentioned.

SGR put the question to a spokesperson for Lane last week, and received the academic version of the venerable Shermanesque declination to run for or serve as President. Noting that reports of a departure were circulating within NSF, the spokesperson said, "We want to put a stop to this rumor." Lane, she said, plans to finish out his six-year appointment, which began in October 1993, a message he repeated in a telephone call to SGR two days later.

A physicist and former Provost of Rice University, Lane is well-regarded in political and science-policy circles for managing NSF during the often-tumultuous shift to Republican control of Capitol Hill. In particular, he is credited with shielding the social and behavioral sciences at NSF from the wrath of the Republican right.

With his Deputy gone and still to be replaced, and various other senior slots filled on an acting basis, a premature departure from the helm of the Foundation would likely offend the chieftains of NSF's university clientele. Though they tend to skimp on political support when NSF needs help, they view the NSF staff as bound to a sacred mission: sending them money.

Two staff departures and successor appointments last month at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy: ***Joyce B. Justus***, Assistant Director for Social and Behavioral Sciences and Education, left to return to the Office of the President of the University of California. Her successor at OSTP is ***Ruby Takanishi***, who comes from the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development at the Carnegie Corporation, New York. And ***Gerald T. Garvey***, OSTP Assistant Director for Physical Science and Engineering, has returned to the Los Alamos National Laboratory. Replacing him is ***Beverly Hartline***, on leave from the Continuous Electron Beam Accelerator Facility, Newport News, Va.

At the National Institutes of Health: ***Marvin Cassman*** has been named Director of the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, a post he's filled on an acting basis since 1993, when ***Ruth L. Kirschstein*** was appointed Deputy Director of NIH. ***Timothy P. Gordon*** has been appointed Associate Director for Science Policy at the National Institute on Drug Abuse, where he will also head NIDA's Office of Science Policy and Communications. Gordon, with NIDA since 1992, had been serving as Chief of Science Policy.

In Print

(Continued from Page 8)

industry opposition." Observing that the opposition continues from the rendering and feed industries, the report points out that "While the ban would cause increased business and production costs for the US rendering and feed industries, it might also safeguard the beef industry from a possible crisis in consumer confidence as occurred in Europe." Judith A. Johnson and Donna U. Vogt wrote the report.

US National Science Foundation: An Overview (95-307 SPR; 6 pp.), a brief update report, mainly focused on the Foundation's finances, which, in contrast to the gloomy accounts of NSF's managers, clients and friends, are depicted as robust. "The NSF has enjoyed remarkable growth," says the CRS report, noting that, "Even when inflation is taken into account, its growth increased (in constant 1987 dollars) by 68.7 percent" between 1986 and 1996. The report, by Christine M. Matthews, notes that in presenting next year's budget, NSF Director Neal Lane "acknowledged that many difficult decisions had to be made in order to achieve the appropriate balance in the portfolio of investments for the agency." And it cites plans to eliminate NSF's $50 million program for modernizing academic research facilities. But, apart from those references to fiscal stringency, the report presents a rosy version of NSF's budget situation, with no hint of researchers' lamentations about the imbalance between supply and demand for the Foundation's funds.

Human Embryo Research (95-910 SPR; 6 pp.), another update, reviews the Congressionally mandated prohibition on human embryo research, which the House has voted to continue through fiscal 1997, while a decision is still pending in the Senate. The report is by Irene E. Stith-Coleman.

From the CRS Environment and Natural Resources Division:

Research Provisions in the Enacted 1996 Farm Bill and Issues for Further Consideration (96-596 ENR; 6 pp.), notes that just a few changes concerning research—mainly dealing with advisory authority—were included in the big farm bill that Congress passed this year. And those changes are to expire next year in anticipation of a thoroughgoing review and rewrite of agricultural research legislation. The report, by Jean M. Rawson, notes various unresolved issues, including a White House proposal to replace pork-barrel appropriations for applied research with competitively based awards.

Order through the office of a Member of Congress: House switchboard: 202/225-3121; Senate, 202/224-3121; address: US House of Representatives, Washington, DC 20515; US Senate, Washington, DC 20510. Identify the Congressional Research Service as the source of the report and cite title and number.

From the General Accounting Office (GAO), no charge:

NIH Extramural Research: Internal Controls Are Key to Safeguarding Phase III Trials Against Misconduct (GAO/HEHS-96-117; 22 pp.), a tiptoeing, inconclusive assessment of NIH procedures for assuring integrity in clinical trials. The GAO says existing controls are effective, except when they're not, and that changes recommended by an NIH working committee have been adopted, except for those deemed inappropriate by NIH.

Higher Education: Tuition Increasing Faster Than Household Income and Public College Costs (GAO/HEHS-96-154; 76 pp.), focused on public institutions, echoes reports of tuitions zooming up at three times the rate of median family income since 1980-81. The main causes, says the GAO, are rising costs and a decline in state appropriations.

Statistical Agencies: A Comparison of the US and Canadian Statistical Systems (GAO/GGD-96-142; 28 pp.), says the big difference is that US government statistical services are scattered among 11 big agencies primarily concerned with that task, plus 60 others, while Canada has concentrated the work in one agency, Statistics Canada. Canadian authorities claimed superiority for their system, the GAO reports, citing uniformity in data collection and ease of access for analytical purposes to a wide variety of material. The GAO noted that confidentiality requirements limit data sharing among American agencies. The report was requested by Chairmen John Kasich of the House Budget Committee and Stephen Horn of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Order from: USGAO, PO Box 6015, Gaithersburg, Md. 20884-6015; tel. 202/512-6000; fax 301/258-4066.

From the National Science Foundation:

Science in the Baltic States (no charge), brief reports on research institutions and activities in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, by Norbert Bikales, head of NSF's Europe office, based on visits to the region last spring.

Order from: NSF, Europe Office, PSC 116, Box A-211, APO AE 09777; tel. (33) 1 43 12 21 08; fax (33) 1 43 12 29 04.

In Print

Official reports and other publications of special interest to the research community

(Copies of publications listed here are available from the indicated sources—not from SGR)

From the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD):

Main Science and Technology Indicators 1996 (two issues annually, $55; on diskette, $125), in the first issue for this year, the usual extensive statistical data on R&D expenditures, patents, high-tech trade, etc., in the 27 industrialized nations that comprise the OECD. The report notes a general continuation in the worldwide R&D spending slowdown that began in 1990. In the doted-on but dubiously meaningful measure of percentage of GNP devoted to research, Japan was first in 1994, with 2.69 percent, followed by the US, with 2.54 percent. The OECD data, collected from the R&D scorekeepers of the member nations, are regularly cited in national debates over the adequacy of R&D spending for keeping up with other countries.

Also available: OECD's ***Basic Science and Technology Statistics: 1995 Edition*** (470 pp., $75), presenting even more data about R&D and related matters. Both publications are in English and French.

Order from: OECD Publications and Information Center, 2001 L St. NW, Suite 650, Washington, DC 20036-4922; tel. 202/785-6323; fax 202/785-0350; also available from booksellers and OECD offices in many major cities around the world.

From the Office of Technology Policy, US Department of Commerce:

Foreign Science & Technology Information Sources in the Federal Government and Select Private Sector Organizations (228 pp., no charge), lists scores of US government agencies and private organizations that "monitor, collect, disseminate, or conduct analysis of information involving foreign science and technology." Contacts and addresses are provided for each of them. But for some of the biggest collectors of all, the CIA and its Pentagon affiliates, the big book offers no more than an appendix containing homepage Internet addresses. The collection, far more extensive than previous efforts along these lines, was assembled with funding from the Commerce and State departments. Many of the agencies are poised to assist cold callers, but for obtaining help from some of the others, SGR says, Good luck.

Order from: US Department of Commerce, Office of Technology, Publications, Washington, DC 20230; tel. 202/482-3037; fax 202/482-4817.

From the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy, University of California, Berkeley:

America's Technical Fix: The Pentagon's Dual Use Strategy, TRP, and the Political Economy of US Technology Policy in the Clinton Era (60 pp., $8), by Jay Stowsky, Senior Economist for Science and Technology, 1993-95, on the White House Council of Economic Advisers. A condensed review of the Clinton Administration's meandering efforts to shift Pentagon procurement toward commercial off-the-shelf products and, through the Technology Reinvestment Project (TRP), to promote both civilian and military benefits from R&D spending by Defense and other federal agencies. By requiring peer review and cost sharing by industry, TRP successfully avoided pork-barrel pressures, says Stowksy, now Director of Research Policy and Development in the Office of the President of the University of California. But purity cost the program political support in pork-hungry Congress, he observes, while the ingrates of industry focused their lobbying on the bigger prizes of tax reduction and regulatory relief. Meanwhile, he notes, the Pentagon, fearful of distractions from its weapons programs, has resisted the basic design of extracting double duty from its R&D expenditures. The study was supported by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation and the Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore laboratories.

Order from: Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy, University of California at Berkeley, 2234 Piedmont Ave. #2322, Berkeley, California 94720-2322; tel. 510/642-3067; fax 510/643-6617; e-mail: brie@garnet.berkeley.edu

---

From the Southern Technology Council, a division of the Southern Growth Policies Board:

Technology-based Entrepreneurism in the South (84 pp., $10), a special issue of *Southern Growth* magazine marking the 10th anniversary of the 15-state Southern Technology Council. Much of the material was drawn from a conference at the University of Mississippi in November 1995 under the title of "Keeping It Home," which refers to a finding that commercial ideas spawned at southern universities are often profitably adopted by manufacturing firms elsewhere. To expand manufacturing and employment in the region, several articles suggest, universities must build up both their research capabilities and working ties with nearby industry and local and state governments.

Order from: Southern Technology Council, PO Box 12293, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina 27709; tel. 919/941-5145; fax 919/941-5594.

From the Science Policy Research Division, part of the Congressional Research Service (CRS) in the Library of Congress, no charge:

"Mad Cow Disease" or Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy [BSE]: Scientific and Regulatory Issues (96-641 SPR, 6 pp.), notes that while no cases of BSE have been reported in the US, federal agencies have taken several precautionary steps, some dating back to 1989, when the Department of Agriculture banned the importation of live ruminants and various ruminant products from countries where BSE has been identified. In 1994, the Food and Drug Administration issued preliminary notices banning the use of offal from adult sheep and goats in animal feed. But, the CRS states, the "rule was never finalized in part because of

(Continued on Page 7)